

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office action mailed December 28, 2009 and the Advisory Action mailed March 19, 2010, the Examiner's claim rejections have been considered. Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections regarding all pending claims and earnestly solicit allowance of these claims.

#### **1. Interview Summary**

Applicant's counsel would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of discussing the pending claims in view of the cited references in a telephonic interview on February 26, 2010. Primarily, claim 1 was discussed in view of the cited references. A possible amendment to claim 1 including clarifying that the contour lines "surround" the data points and represent points of equal value was also discussed. On an initial review, the Examiner agreed that such an amendment would overcome the current rejection of the claims. It was also agreed that page 8, lines 9-20 and FIG. 2 of the current application provided support for the proposed amendment discussed during the telephonic interview. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to include these limitations.

#### **2. Formal Drawing Figures**

Applicant has attached formal drawing sheets 1 through 9 to replace the originally filed drawing sheets 1 through 9.

#### **3. Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 102 – Claims 1-5 and 8-12**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al. in view of Wong. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. For the sake of brevity, the rejections of the independent claims 1 and 8 are discussed in detail on the understanding that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the cited references, as they depend directly from their respective independent claims. Nevertheless, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of the independent claims, provide further, separate and independent bases for patentability.